

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1-18 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1 and 11 are independent. In the Office Action dated June 16, 2008, Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 1-6, 8-12, and 14-18 remain in this application with Claims 7 and 13 being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and new Claim 19 being added by this Amendment. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Interview Summary

Applicants thank Examiner Williams and Senior Examiner Salad for the courtesy of a telephone interview on August 19, 2008, requested by the undersigned to discuss the rejection of the current claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. During the interview, Applicants asserted that the cited references do not render obvious the claims as amended. The Examiner agreed that the amendments appear to overcome the references. No agreement was reached regarding patentability.

II. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action dated June 16, 2008, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-7, 9-13, and 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,347,342 ("*Marcos*") in view of U.S. Pub. Patent App. No. 2004/0260820 ("*Bearman*"). The Examiner rejected Claims 8 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Marcos* in view of *Bearman* and in further view of U.S. Patent No.

6,976,846 ("*Dupont*"). Claims 1 and 11 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references for at least the reason that it recites, "registering a first object and a second object as users of an instant messaging service computer" and "authenticating the first object and the second object as registered users of the instant messaging computer." Amended Claim 11 includes a similar recitation. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 7, lines 4-10.

In contrast, *Marcos* at least does not teach or suggest the aforementioned recitation. For example, *Marcos* merely discloses brokering messages among objects. (See *Marcos*, Abstract.) In *Marcos*, a mediating component determines whether a system can service a request from another system. (See *Marcos*, col. 7, lines 6-7.) However, as the Examiner states, *Marcos* does not disclose either using an instant messaging channel for object communication or authenticating the objects. (See Office Action, page 3, lines 13-14; page 6, lines 11-12.) Thus, *Marcos* cannot disclose registering objects with an instant messaging server or authenticating both the sending and receiving objects. Rather, *Marcos* merely discloses determining whether a requested service can be provided between objects.

Furthermore, *Bearman* does not overcome *Marcos*'s deficiencies. *Bearman* merely discloses authorizing an enterprise system's users. (See *Bearman*, para. [0067].) If *Bearman*'s user wishes to access the enterprise system, the user provides security accessing information (e.g., user ID and password) to an automated attendant.

(See *Bearman*, para. [0067].) Like *Marcos*, *Bearman* does not disclose registering objects with an instant messaging server or authenticating both the sending and receiving objects. Rather, *Bearman* merely discloses requiring a username and password from a sender.

Combining *Marcos* with *Bearman* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Marcos* and *Bearman*, either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose "registering a first object and a second object as users of an instant messaging service computer" and "authenticating the first object and the second object as registered users of the instant messaging computer," as recited by amended Claim 1. Amended Claims 11 includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1 and 11 each patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1 and 11

Dependent Claims 2-6, 8-10, 12, and 14-18 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1 and 11, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1 and 11. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 2-6, 8-10, 12, and 14-18.

III. New Claims

Claim 19 has been added to more distinctly define and to round out the protection for the invention to which Applicants are entitled. Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable over the cited art and that they add no new matter.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
404.954.5066

Date: August 27, 2008

By: /D. Kent Stier/
D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

DKS:sm

